REMARKS

Claims 1-110 were filed with the present application and were subject to a restriction requirement. The invention of Group I, claims 1-28 and 51-80 was elected, and claims 29-50 and 81-110 were cancelled. Claims 13, 16, 63 and 66 were cancelled in a response dated 9 June 2006; claims 6, 7, 56, and 57 were cancelled, and new claims 111-128 were added in the response dated 8 January 2007. Claims 1-5, 8-12, 14, 15, 17-28, and 111-128 have been cancelled. Therefore, claims 51-55, 58-62, 64-65, and 67-80 are currently under consideration.

Rejections under 35 USC §103

Claims 1-5, 8-12, 14, 17-28, 51-55, 58-62, 64-65, and 67-80, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over US 2003/00227021, to Yamazaki *et al.*, in view of US 6,759,689, to Adomis, *et al.* The rejection is traversed.

Claim 51 specifies that the "first metal-containing layer is transparent to light." The Office action states that because Yamazaki's metal-containing layer is characterized as partially absorbing, it is not completely absorbing, and would therefore be partially transparent (paragraph 6, page 4). With respect, Applicants submit that this reasoning is erroneous. Light that is not absorbed by a surface may be transmitted through the surface or reflected off it. In the context of the Yamazaki patent application, the metal-containing layer is characterized as having low reflectance, and the statement that the layer is partially absorbing refers to its function of not reflecting light. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office action has erroneously concluded that the partially absorbing layer is transparent. In fact, the reference is completely silent regarding a metal-containing layer that is transparent.

In addition, the metal-containing layer of claim 5 of the reference is represented in FIG. 1A and 1B as part of multi-layered film 24. This layer is not disposed between

cathode/anode 18b (paragraph 0094) and cathode/anode 21, as required by the instant claims.

The Office action goes on to admit that Yamazaki does not disclose that the metal layer contains a plurality of domains that are discontinuous, and proposes to supply the deficiency with the metal layer disclosed by Adomis, which is patterned with "dotes or islands." Applicants respectfully urge again that substituting the partially reflecting/partially transmitting metal layer disclosed by Adomis for Yamazaki's "partially absorbing" film would result in an inoperative device, since the function of the film in Yamazaki's device would be lost thereby. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 51 and its dependent claims are not obvious in view of the combination of the references. It is believed that the rejection is hereby overcome.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mary Louise Gioeni/
Mary Louise Gioeni
Patent Attorney
Registration No. 41,779

General Electric Company
Global Research Center
1 Research Circle – K1-3A70
Niskayuna, New York 12309
(518) 387-6648

September 30, 2008